

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 12-16 and 21-24 and 27.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 11 and 25 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-28 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed September 9, 2005, claims 1, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,049 to Bellaouar et al. (hereinafter, "Bellaouar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,812,783 to Honjo et al. (hereinafter, "Honjo"). Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellaouar in view of Honjo and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,473,640 to Bortolini et al. (hereinafter, "Bortolini"). Claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellaouar in view of Honjo, Bortolini, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,217 to Weindorf (hereinafter, "Weindorf"). Claims 11, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellaouar in view of Honjo and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,130 to Abe et al. (hereinafter, "Abe"). Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellaouar in view of Honjo, Abe, and further in view of Weindorf. Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellaouar in view of Honjo, Abe, and further in

view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,509 to Mole et al. (hereinafter, "Mole"). It is noted that claim 1 has been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part:

whereby a feedback loop in a locked state is configured, wherein signal flow of the feedback loop is periodically varied in a predetermined period, the predetermined period including the timing of performing an operation of phase comparison between the output frequency signal and the reference signal in the phase comparator.

The outstanding Office Action admits that Bellaouar fails to teach a signal flow of the feedback loop is periodically varied in a predetermined period. Honjo is cited as allegedly curing the deficiencies that exist in Bellaouar.

Honjo discloses a phase locked loop (PLL) circuit used in a video recorder (VTR). In the circuit of Honjo, when a rotary head is alternated, a discontinuous phase change occurs in a reference signal d, which is to be inputted into a phase comparator 2. In order to prevent outputting discontinuous phase information during the rotary head switching, Honjo teaches inhibiting operation of the phase comparator 2 during the switching and simultaneous transition of a head switching signal (HSW). Honjo neither discloses nor suggests varying signal flow in the feedback loop during a predetermined period including the timing of performing an operation of phase comparison between the output frequency signal and the reference signal in the phase comparator.

Moreover, the Applicant submits that none of the cited references, nor combination thereof, discloses or suggests at least the combination of features of a feedback loop in a locked state is configured, wherein signal flow of the feedback loop is periodically varied in a predetermined period, the predetermined period including the timing of performing an operation of phase comparison between the output frequency signal and the reference signal in the phase comparator, as recited in claim 1, as amended.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art of record. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-28, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 024016-00020.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

CMM/MLC